



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

De Iliadis Fontibus et Compositione, scripsit MATTHAEUS VALETON, litt. hum. dr., gymn. Arnh. conr. (Lugduni Batavorum apud E. J. Brill, 1915. 8vo, pp. VII + 337).

In this volume are collected the seven articles relating to the rise of the Tale of Troy and the genesis of the Iliad, which Valeton published between the years 1912 and 1915 in the *Mnemosyne*. That students of the Homeric question will be glad to have access to these essays in this more convenient form is a matter of course. Their joy must, however, be tempered by the fact that the articles are—in the most literal sense—reprinted. Such a method of publication inevitably entails a dropping behind of the work; especially when, as seems true in the present case, the composition is essentially a unit. As the separate articles passed through the press, references to later works were sometimes added in the footnotes; but in the *addenda* no such effort has been made, and thus the book is nearly four years old at the moment of its birth. The misprints, also, have had to stand exactly as they first appeared. That they are many is shown by the list of *corrigenda et addenda* extending over seven double-column pages; although obvious errors—such as misspellings, and false accents—are ignored, and a number of *δεύτεραι φροντίδες* in the later chapters had already supplemented or corrected earlier statements.

The book's most prominent defect is the limited acquaintance shown with the work done by others upon the subject of which it treats. In part this comes from the author's belief that linguistics and archaeology can contribute little or nothing to the solution of the problem. To this point I shall return later, noting here merely the fact that the author has thus been led to confine his reading to studies in mythology and analyses of the poem. Even within these limits he seems governed by certain national prepossessions. He is familiar with the works of Naber and van Leeuwen, and with a fair selection of German writings. But of works in French—not to speak of Italian,—I have noted not a single citation; while those from English writings are so sporadic, that they may be repeated here: Grote, *History of Greece* (p. 254); Leaf, a work not specified (p. 126) and *A Companion to the Iliad* (p. 246); Agnes M. Clerke, *Familiar Studies in Homer* (p. 178);

and Shewan, *The Lay of Dolon* (p. 250). To these must be added the mention, p. 2, of Andrew Lang as a Unitarian.

Every effort to study the composition of the *Iliad* must rest upon some belief about the source and trustworthiness of our text; and in my opinion the chance of success must depend very largely upon the degree of clearness with which the student grasps this most fundamental aspect of the problem. To the first half of the question Valetton's answer is to be found, pp. 259-66, in his discussion of the recension of Peisistratos. Space forbids the following out of his argument—which I believe could be strengthened—but his conclusions seem in the main correct. There was an early Attic edition due to Solon, Peisistratos or Hipparchos—the name does not matter—which was not the first reduction of the poem to writing, but the (essentially successful) re-establishment of its earlier form, increased by the Athenian interpolations. Here exception must be taken to the idea of restoring the poem to its earlier form. The Athenian statesman who imported the Ionian text can have had no antiquarian interests. What he wanted was simply a poem as good as possible for recitation at the festival of the Panathenaia, and he secured it according to his lights. He had no scruples to deter him from altering the poem whenever he thought he could better adapt it to his needs—that would seem merely improving it. One thing we can say of his work in general: free composition on a large scale was beyond his power, otherwise the stamp of sixth century Athens would be on the poem even plainer than it now is. From this edition our *Iliad* is descended.

At this point Valetton drops the problem, and hence it may fairly be assumed that his views are like those since expressed by Bethe, who holds, *Homer* I 50-6, that the text of Aristarchos was essentially identical with that of Peisistratos, and the text of Ludwich with that of Aristarchos. The last proposition will have to be appreciably modified in the light of my article, *The Archetype of our Iliad and the Papyri*, *A. J. P.* XXXV 125-48, and of additional evidence which I now have ready for publication. The former simply flies in the face of the positive proofs for the fluctuation of the Homeric text in the third, fourth and fifth centuries—a brilliant presentation of which has been given by Gilbert Murray, *R. G. E.*, pp. 298-325, in the chapter headed *From Known to Unknown*. The foundation for the error seems to be a belief that the writing of the text must have stereotyped the epos—an idea sufficiently refuted—cf. Meier, *Werden u. Leben des Volks-epos*, pp. 28 f. and note 107—by parallels from the *epê* of other peoples.

There is thus a factor in the solution of the problem—the later fluctuation of the text—of which Valetton is apparently

unaware, and which Bethe explicitly denies. To a great extent this factor is an *x* and must remain so; but it is one thing to carry it consciously as such—cf. Robert, *Studien zur Ilias*, pp. 575 f.—and quite another thing to believe that it does not exist.

I turn next to Valetón's theory of the composition of the *Iliad*. The nucleus was a poem on the Wrath of Achilles. The greater complexity of its plot distinguished it from the innumerable poems, in which the Tale of Troy had previously been developed, and made it a more artistic sort of poetry, the opening of a new era. Its author is the principle author of the *Iliad* and may be termed Homer. The name, to which no historical value is attached, may also be employed as a collective designation for all who have worked upon the poem.

The contradiction between the *Πρεσβεία* and the *Πατρόκλεια* is taken (p. 177) as the fundament of the analysis. The point has, of course, been repeatedly made, and is, to my mind, perfectly obvious. The most plausible attempt to explain it away, Lang, *The World of Homer*, pp. 234 ff., is unknown to Valetón; though it deserves discussion on account of its ingeniousness, and the fascination of the literary form in which it is presented. Valetón does well to point to the fact that Rothe, *Ilias*, p. 281, is driven to assume that the beginning of II is interpolated. His treatment must, however, suffer from the inevitable comparison with the original and brilliant interpretation of the passages which has meanwhile been published by Bethe, *Homer I* 70 ff.

This leads to the alternative: either the *Πατρόκλεια*, or the *Πρεσβεία* with its pendant the *Μήνιδος ἀπόρρησις* was not part of the original Achilleïs. Valetón's contribution is the rejection of the *Πατρόκλεια*. The general course of the poem, as he conceives it, was a defeat of the Greeks, now found in Δ-O, terminated by the setting of the sun, © 485 ff., a successful Embassy to Achilles, and the Renunciation of his Wrath as the close of the poem.

The hypothesis is about as unattractive as can well be imagined. Yet, if looked at in itself, simply as a problem in analysis, it must be pronounced possible. The conclusion I should draw from this and from the other analyses published in recent years is the need of controlling them by some more objective criteria. It is well to recall the words addressed by Wilhelm v. Humboldt to Wolf: "The *cardo rerum* lies in my opinion entirely in the fact that there will be differences of style, language, etc., in the *Iliad*". To them we may add that, thanks above all to the archaeological work inaugurated by Schliemann, we now have independently of the poem, a knowledge of the development of civilization about the shores of the Aegean, which may serve as a further check upon any attempt at analysis.

Such ideas are very curtly thrust aside by Valetton (pp. 172, 174), in a way that brings him into harmony with thoughts expressed by many unitarians—cf. most recently Shewan's industrious article, *The Oneness of the Homeric Language*, *Class. Phil.* X (1915) 151-65. The question is too vast for discussion here. I can merely record my conviction that more has already been accomplished than our unitarian friends realize. Bechtel's excellent book, for instance, is not to be discarded with a reference to a hypothesis that A is the latest part of the *Iliad* (especially not by one who has no faith in that hypothesis)—it is the hypothesis that must go. And furthermore, there is good ground for hope of progress in this direction. It will have to come slowly, with a distinction of what is reasonably certain, from what is probable, or merely possible. Otherwise it will not carry conviction. It will be impeded also by two difficulties: the necessity of clearing away some modern misunderstandings; and, what is much more difficult, the need of grappling as closely as possible with the problem of the corruption of the text in later antiquity.

Even at present we are in a position to test Valetton's hypothesis. Without going any further than the question of style—we may trust to the *ἄλογος αἰσθησις* to discriminate between I and T or between T and A; not to mention the finer but obvious differences between A and I. Valetton himself declares (p. 173) "*auctoribus nonnullarum Iliadis partium ut librorum Y-Ω, perlegentem vix fugere potest, sermonem epicum temporis decursu rigidiores factum, ad mentem clare enuntiantem non prorsus suffecisse*", quoting Ed. Meyer's, *Gesch. d. Altert.* II, p. 405, similar statement about T-Ω. Of the six books named by Meyer none produces this impression more strongly than T, and this fact alone is sufficient ground for rejecting Valetton's hypothesis. The stylistic impression can be confirmed by comparing Bechtel for the contract forms, and for the digamma, my article, *A. J. P.* XXXIII, p. 417.

Valetton's reconstruction of his *Achilleïs*¹ in detail runs somewhat as follows. Up to B 49 as in our *Iliad* except that a mention (A 145-7) of Idomeneus, who does not figure in the original poem, has been interpolated, and perhaps the return of Chryseïs. The *Διάπειρα* is set aside as referring to the tenth year of the war, and the poem resumes with B 442-83; the Catalogue is also an intrusion, and B 786-815. F 1-14 brings to a close this portion of the poem. Disregarding minor episodes ΓΔΕ are a unit, the same is true of ΖΗ; the second group is by a different hand but presupposes the former. The attitude of Zeus to Hera is so fundamentally different in Δ 5 ff. from what it is in A 517 ff. that it is impossible to assign

¹ Its text is printed, pp. 267-324. as an *Excursus*.

them to the same author. The Κόλος μάχη is also rejected because of the knowledge (474) of the Πατρόκλεια, and its indebtedness to all parts of the Iliad. The close of the book 485 ff. is the transition to the Embassy, and stood after the close of O in the original poem. For the Δολώνεια there is no room; but with Λ we resume the course of the Achilleis. The opening of that book (1-84) is rejected, and also of course 501-20, 575-848 the references to the Πατρόκλεια. With its close is involved the opening of the Τειχομαχία, which also assumes a ten years' duration of the war. The close of the battle begun in Λ is found in N 136-55, O 592-5, 653-8, 674-746 the only parts of NΞO regarded as coming from the Achilleis. Its termination is brought about by the setting of the sun Θ 485-565, which is followed by the Embassy, altered so as to make it successful (I 1-317, 344-7, 356-64, 378, 379, 388-92, 421-648. Π 60-3, νῦν δ' ἤτοι μὲν ἐγὼ παύω χόλον· ὥς γὰρ ἄμεινον, I 649, 656-63, 669-77,

κείνος μνηθμόν ἐθέλει σβέσαι ἥδ' ἐδέχεσθαι
δῶρα τὰ οἱ δώσεις· νοέειν δέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀνώγει
ὅππως κεν νῆάς τε σοφὴ καὶ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν.

688-90, 712-3.) And finally, T 1-2, 40-208, 215-76, The Renunciation of the Wrath.

Some poet proposed to give a different account of the return of Achilles to the battle. For this purpose he cut away the ending of the poem—beginning Θ 485—and substituted the Πατρόκλεια with its necessary consequence the Ἔκτορος ἀναίρεσις.¹ Certain inconsistencies were entailed by this procedure, but were either not observed or were accepted. The poem has afterwards been interpolated, and Valetton endeavors to determine its original extent which he defines, pp. 222 f. Ψ and Ω are later additions.

The fusion of the two poems was made by a διασκευαστής whose only contribution was the Κόλος μάχη. Many of the additions to the poem are older than his work, and Valetton thinks that for these the following order may be determined: bulk of ΓΔΕ, Τειχοσκοπία, wounding of Eurypylos, Τειχομαχία, the bulk of NΞO. Whether the Διάπειρα and the Catalogue are older or younger than Θ is uncertain; but the Catalogue is younger than the Διάπειρα, which NΞO surpass in age. Younger than the Catalogue are the battle of Achilles and Aineias, the mention of Asteropeios and the Δολώνεια, of which the last is younger than Θ. Before the Διάπειρα is to be placed ΖΗ which are, however, not equal to the Τειχομαχία in age.

To enter into a discussion of these details would be fruitless for one who cannot agree with the fundamental hypothesis of

¹A Ἔκτορος ἀναίρεσις is the necessary consequence to the Πατρόκλεια; that our X and the nucleus of Π have the same origin, does not follow.

the author. Instead I may call attention to the remaining section of this portion of the book, pp. 243-59, which is devoted to a refutation of the arguments intended to exclude all hypotheses that assume a plurality of authorship. Muelder, Rothe, van Leeuwen, and Bethe are the authors whose views are chiefly discussed; and the selection, though far from complete, is fairly typical. Some of the arguments stand or fall with Valeton's own hypothesis; but many of the other points are well taken, and deserve careful consideration. It is in my opinion the best portion of the book.

The remainder of the work, pp. 1-168, is devoted to a study in *Sagenverschiebung*. The Tale of Troy built up *sescentorum poetarum ope* is here traced back to some fourteen poems or cycles of poems, the subject matter of which, their place of origin and their relative chronology Valeton believes he can determine. Certain general convictions again forbid my entering upon a detailed discussion of his views. The Tale of Troy is undoubtedly very complex in its origin, and at times we do seem to get illuminating glimpses into the process of its growth—for instance in the combats of Idomeneus with Phaistos, of Tlepolemus with Sarpedon. But to believe that we can start from the Iliad alone and work out a solution of any considerable probability requires a faith in our powers of divination stronger than I can muster in view of the very tangled epic legends of other peoples—cf. Meier, p. 7 f.—which have been unravelled only in the light of historical information.

To attempt to simplify the problem—by supposing that the legends existed only in poetical form, that the growth of the saga was completed before the composition of the Achilleis, that the geographical horizon of the legends was necessarily limited, seems to me but shutting our speculations into bounds within which error alone can prevail. For each of these hypotheses, however convenient it may be, is in itself extremely improbable, to say the least.

Historical information we must have, and for it it is futile to look to late writers. We have seen theories built on that basis, and Crusius has shown how they crumple like houses built upon the sand. Hector of Thebes finds no favor in Valeton's eyes; Paris is still to be sure a Peloponnesian, but Aeneas of Gaza is not cited as proof. Ister, however, is quoted and Bethe's interpretation "Alexander the Thessalian Paris" defended against Crusius; although it should be evident that Ister, whatever he may have said, is not a competent witness to the fact he is adduced to prove. It is to geography and archaeology that we must look for aid. Starting from this point, Mr. Leaf in his splendid book, *Troy, A Study in Homeric Geography* (1912) has gone far towards determining the nu-

cleus of historic fact around which the Trojan saga has grown. There are details in the book which may be questioned, but that the outlines at least of the Trojan legend are rooted in historical reality seems to me indisputable. That is the one firm point from which we can start, and it at once puts hypotheses such as Valetón's out of consideration.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion. Vol. i. Zeus, God of the Bright Sky. By ARTHUR BERNARD COOK. 8vo, xliii+885 pp. Cambridge University Press. \$13.50.

The last comprehensive monograph on Zeus was published by T. B. Emeric-David at Paris in 1833. Since that time a large amount of new material has come to light, which has been worked up in numerous discussions of various phases of the Zeus-religion. But for a comprehensive treatment of the whole subject we are dependent upon the summary accounts of Preller-Robert, *Griechische Mythologie* (1894), Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* (vol. i, 1896), and Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (vol. ii, 1906). Mr. Cook now offers us a volume of over 900 pages by way of a first instalment with the promise of another volume that bids fair to be of equal magnitude.

In the earlier sections—the book has but one chapter—the author attempts to show that originally Zeus, 'the Bright One', was conceived 'not in anthropomorphic fashion as the bright sky-god, but simply as the bright sky itself'. In some cases the evidence which he presents in favour of this view is of very doubtful value. Then follows a discussion of the mountain-cults of Zeus. These can be classified in a roughly chronological order according as they involve a mere altar, or an altar with a statue of the god, or an altar with a statue enclosed in a temple. Of special interest is a series of cult-monuments in the form of rude thrones found on the tops of mountains in Asia Minor, the islands of the Archipelago, and even Greece itself. These were cut out of the living rock 'by some unknown people at some unknown date—possibly by the Hittites in the fourteenth and following centuries B. C.—' and later by the Greeks brought into connection with their own mountain-god.

The main topic of the book is 'Zeus in relation to the Sun', pp. 186-730. This is divided into sub-topics corresponding to the various objects that were popularly identified with the sun, viz., an eye, a wheel, a bird, a ram, a bull, and a bronze man.